



CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON

ACADEMIC SENATE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES NOVEMBER 3, 2015

Approved 11-10-15

11:30 AM - 12:50 PM

PLN-120

Present: Bonney, Casem, Dabirian, Guerin, Meyer, Oliver, Sargeant, Stang, Stohs, Walker

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Bonney called the meeting to order at 11:30 AM.

II. URGENT BUSINESS

(Guerin) Requested an update from VP Danny Kim on efforts to prevent suicides from the campus parking structures.

III. ANNOUNCEMENTS

- Dabirian: Is encouraging faculty to use Eduroam. We are going to do a Campaign to have everyone change their wireless to Eduroam, it works on campus and everywhere else.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

No minutes.

V. CHAIR'S REPORT (Bonney)

Chair Bonney reported on topics below.

- Met with the Provost and our conversation centered on two issues: the search committee issues and textbooks.
- One issue with search committees is it has become routine practice to have administrators serve as chairs of the committees in order to have access to support from administrative assistants. This often results in the organization of committee meetings based on the administrator's schedule, not the other committee members. The second issue is that faculty have been told they may not rank the finalist even when they wish to do so.
 - Perhaps we should add language to the respective UPS indicating that at the time a faculty member is nominated to serve on a search committee, his or her schedule is considered in order to ensure that should they be confirmed, the schedule will allow him or her to participate actively. The UPS should also specify that scheduling will be based on the faculty members' schedules and not on the administrator's schedule.
 - Ranking of the finalist could be allowed, so long as it is clear in the UPS that the ranking is just a recommendation.
 - Our UPS doesn't address our practice on this campus of an open search for the finalist. Job candidates participate in Open Forums, speaking to members of departments, staff and others whose input should be made available to the Provost when it comes to making the final decision. The UPS could be modified to formalize the process and acknowledge the value of the input from multiple constituencies.
 - Q: Does the policy say whether the search committee reviews the job announcement before it goes out? This has been an issue before.
 - We need to make all of the process more explicit so the search committees and people who are doing the reviewing have clear expectations.
 - Suggestion: to have the committee elect a co-chair (a faculty member), to run the meetings when the chair is not available. The co-chair needs to be someone who is willing to take notes, send out meeting announcements and reminders.
 - We need to standardize when in the process the committee is constituted and when it becomes involved in the search. It can be a problem when the committee hasn't been involved in developing the job description and when asked a question by the candidate is unable to respond effectively.
 - The feedback will be sent to FAC. Chair will advise committee to feel free to consult individuals who have served on search committees or run searches or they can speak with anyone on Exec who has been involved with searches.

- The searches for the University Librarian position and UEE this spring will be done without an external search firm. We will learn whether there is value to the use of external firms.
- We received a letter from JeeLoo Liu and a letter from the Math department. Chair would like to send out the Math department letter and the JeeLoo Liu letter together with a cover letter stating Executive Committee does not take a position with regard to either document. The authors of both requested that we share and we are doing so. That said, any future documents will be reviewed by the Executive Committee and forwarded to the Faculty Affairs Committee.
- Q: when will there be a decision on the grievance?
- A: the committee will make its recommendation by the end of this week, then President has 21 days to take any action. .
 - Further discussion on how best to transmit the Math Department letter and consensus to attach that document, letter from Jon Brusckke and letter from JeeLoo Liu to next chair's report with additional comment that any letters or other documents received subsequently will be forwarded to the FAC and not distributed campus-wide...
- The other issue we have is the question of getting rid of the At-Large seats.
- Q: Do we have to have a vote?
- A: It's a Constitutional amendment, so if we get a unanimous vote, it's done.
 - Have to get the Constitution committee going right away, they need to put in the provisions of what it would look like.
 - We need get it to the floor.
 - We will have a first reading to make sure everybody understands.
- We need to get a search committee together for the Library position.
 - We had a committee, we will check to make sure everybody that was approved for the search committee are still willing to serve. Chair will contact the faculty members and the Provost will contact non faculty members.
- We need to get a search committee together for the UEE position.
- At the A.S. meeting on November 13th, we will have both the President García and Danny Kim making budget presentations.

VI. PROVOST REPORT

- Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments regarding the proposed development of a UPS to guide the selection of textbooks.
- As you know, I shared some thoughts regarding search process during the last Academic Senate meeting and look forward to future deliberations on this topic.
- As far as phasing out the at-large seats, my personal perspective is that it is an issue that must be resolved by the Academic Senate.
- Q: What is the appropriate role in terms of the role of administration on the Senate? In terms of on the floor and how this would work? Because it is a really interesting conflict of interest if they abstain on everything.
- A: There is a difference between a theoretical conflict of interest and a conflict of interest that occurs in practice. My experience in the last three years is that many of the administrators sitting on the senate are actually faculty that have recently converted to administrators and I have not seen massive abstentions or conflicts. But the bottom line is that the composition of academic senates varies greatly across the country and they all have pros and cons – in this case it boils down to what the Academic Senate as a body would like to look like..
- Q: Back to searches, we have had conversation on Interims and whether or not an Interim is eligible to apply for the permanent position?
- A: There are pros and cons to either one of these options. I have no personal preference and would uphold whatever the policy is.
- Q: Are there discussions at the Academic Council level about homogenizing GE across the CSU and how does it work with regards to GE?
- A: I do not recall such discussions in my time in the CSU. If anything, the Provosts across the system have been asking for more autonomy, not less.
- Q: Regarding the AMP, it was brought to my attention that the Senate should have a public opportunity to comment as a body, so I hope we are building that into the schedule?
- A: We will send a note out to the steering committee following up on some of the topics we discussed last time and there will be a proposed timeline.
 - One thing was that my group requested was not only those specific entities provide comments, but in general people be provided opportunity for comments anytime. As well as specific requested feedback for parts and pieces.

VII. STAFF REPORT (Benjamin Report)

- We received 24 file for the Outstanding Lecturer Award. The Outstanding Professor Committee will begin reviewing the file today.

VIII. COMMITTEE LIAISON REPORTS

8.1 General Education Committee [Casem] F, 10-30-15, 2:00-4:00PM, MH-141

The first item of business was a discussion of the GE assessment plan based on information collected through the GE mapping activity conducted across campus. The committee decided to begin this pilot assessment project by examining GE Learning Goal 1 (Students will demonstrate and apply their understanding of fundamental concepts, methods and theories in natural sciences mathematics, arts and humanities, and social sciences). It was decided that assessment of this learning goal would include evaluation of the three supporting learning outcomes (see UPS 411.203). Two lower division courses (HIST 110A and HCOM 100) and two upper division courses (KNES 342 & THTR 300) were selected by the committee. Selection was based, in part, on a desire to assess across multiple colleges, to examine high enrollment courses, and to avoid over taxing courses that have recently, or will in the near future, undergo GE re-certification.

Three courses were approved for GE credit. They were:

LBST 322 - approved for category D.5 and Z

LBST 340 - approved for category D.5

ASAM 230 - approved for category E and Z

Subcommittees were formed to evaluate applications for GE re-certification in areas B.1 to B.4. The subcommittees will bring their recommendations to the next committee meeting on Nov 13th.

8.2 Planning, Resources & Resources Committee [Meyer] F, 10-30-15, 1:00–2:30 PM, CP-1060-05 Meeting cancelled.

8.3 Student Academic Life Committee [Guerin] T, 11-3-15, 9:00–10:00 AM, MH-141

SALC met this morning. Tonantzin Oseguera told the committee about the feedback on the Behavioral Intervention Team from the various stakeholder groups since our last meeting. Committee members responded enthusiastically and asked about how the information would be disseminated to faculty (including lecturers).

A second topic was previewing the Student Success Initiative website. This website shows the story of the initiative (fee increase) and shows how the funds are used to improve the campus.

IX. NEW BUSINESS

ITEMS BELOW WILL BE MOVED TO NEXT AGENDA 11-10-15.

9.1 [UPS 410.200](#) Program Performance Review Policy [7-11-11]

1. FAC response

9.2 [UPS 411.102](#) Curriculum Guidelines and Procedures: Academic Jurisdiction

9.3 [UPS 411.200](#) General Education Guidelines and Procedures: New and Existing Courses Policy

9.4 Discussion on Smoking

9.5 Follow-up on Retreat. New UPS on Core Competencies?

9.6 Revised ECS Exemption Resolution – Jon Bruschke

9.7 Continue Discussion re Presentation for Proposed Changes to Bylaws & Constitution – CONSTITUENCY ISSUES [from 4-28-15 EC meeting]

Chair Walker started this ongoing discussion will carry over into the summer for the new EC to agendaize. The topic will be brought forward for action – 2015-16 Academic Senate.

9.8 Discussion on Excess Units

9.9 Discussion on Articulation Issues

X. ADJOURNMENT

M/S/P (Dabirian/Oliver) Meeting adjourned at 12:55 PM.